

I am sure that at the last not more than 80,000 colored voted for the co-operative. I do not undertake to say that remainder of the colored people are Democratic ticket, but I do hundreds of them were com-



# THE CAUCASIAN

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY  
BY THE CAUCASIAN PUBLISHING CO.

## SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

ONE YEAR.....\$1.00  
SIX MONTHS......60  
THREE MONTHS......35

Entered at the Post Office in Raleigh, N. C. as second-class mail matter.

## WHY SENATOR McENERY FLOPPED.

Last week Senator McENERY delivered a speech in the Senate trying to defend the grandfather clause of the Louisiana constitutional amendment, and the same clause of the proposed amendment in N. Carolina. During the course of his speech Senator Butler interrupted him and read a letter taken from the New Orleans Times-Democrat written to that paper by Senator McENERY while the amendment was pending before the Louisiana Convention. The letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. Feb. 17, 1898

To the Times-Democrat.

In answer, I say that Section 5 is grossly unconstitutional. I have submitted the same to some of the ablest Democrats of the Senate, who are able to construe the law. They all concur in my opinion that it is unconstitutional. I would defend it in the Senate of the United States.

S. D. McENERY.

Senator Butler then asked Senator McENERY how Section five could be "grossly unconstitutional" then and become constitutional now. Senator McENERY's explanation taken from the Congressional Record, is as follows:

Mr. McENERY.—Yes, sir. When the Constitutional Convention was in session I was telegraphed to know what was my opinion of this section 5. I replied to that telegram that in my opinion it was unconstitutional. I then telegraphed to the Times-Democrat, after its adoption, to know if, when it was attacked, I would defend it in the Senate of the United States. To that telegram I replied that I would.

I stand, Mr. President, always ready to defend the people of Louisiana when their character is attacked. I stand ready to defend them when their interests are in peril. I stand ready to defend them when their laws are assailed.

It is the same way, Mr. President. In reference to my duty to the government of the United States in regard to the war that is now being waged in the Philippines, I do not stop to inquire whether the people of the United States are right or wrong. I do not stop to inquire whether or not the first volley was fired by the Filipinos or by the troops of the United States. It is enough for me to know that the authority and power of this government is assailed and that it is the duty of every citizen, no matter what were his convictions, to rally to the support of the government, not only to send its ships abroad and its armies upon the field and to supply money and munitions of war, but with our great sympathy and whole heart to support the President of the United States and uphold his hand until the enemies of the government are brought under subjection. That same motive, Mr. President, induces me to defend the people of the State of Louisiana when it is assailed.

Senator Butler's only reply to the above explanation was as follows: Mr. Butler.—Mr. President, I think I now understand the Senator. He said the amendment was unconstitutional; but he also said in another letter that his people adopted it, he would do his best to defend it in the United States Senate.

I understand that the Senator is now simply carrying out his pledge to support whatever they adopted, even though they were "grossly unconstitutional." In this connection I will also read a short extract from an editorial in the Times-Democrat from its issue the next day after the constitutional amendment was adopted, commenting upon the same:

"After themselves disowning and flaying denouncing section 5, a majority of the Louisiana Constitutional Convention yesterday passed that offensive section—offensive to Democracy, to political honesty and to Americanism." And the Convention, too, has passed the offensive section in face of the fact that the ablest Democrats in the United States Senate have declared it to be unconstitutional. Senators Caffery and McENERY have protested against its passage, and have declared that it contravenes the Federal Constitution. In this opinion they are joined by such stalwart Democrats and uncompromising champions of the rights of the colored people as Indiana's Lindsey, of Kentucky; Vest, of Missouri; Berry, of Arkansas; Walthall, of Mississippi; Turley, of Tennessee; Pettus, of Alabama, and McRAURIN, of South Carolina, and many members of the House of Representatives.

The above confession made by Senator McENERY completely destroys the effect of any legal opinion that he may now attempt to give on the proposition. If the ballot box stuffers and redshirts mob of North Carolina can get any comfort out of that speech they are welcome to it.

Does not the awkward and unenviable position which Senator McENERY occupies when he confesses he feels it his duty to defend what his State did, though he knows it is grossly unconstitutional, explain the position of a number of Democratic lawyers in North Carolina who are trying to defend the proposed amendment simply because their party adopted it, while in their hearts they know it is grossly unconstitutional?

"Rob Pe or to pay Paul." That is what they do who take stimulants for weak nerves. Hood's Sarsaparilla gives true nerve strength.

## TRYING TO FOOL THE ILLITERATE WHITE VOTER.

The News and Observer in an editorial in last Sunday's issue said: "They (Pritchard and Butler) threaten to disfranchise poor and illiterate whites if the most ignorant, degraded and vicious negroes are disfranchised."

It is difficult to understand how a man who has any sense of honor or shame could deliberately publish such an infamous and bald-faced lie. Nobody knows better than the editor of the News and Observer that it will be the Supreme Court of the United States that will determine whether or not the proposed amendment is constitutional, if it should be adopted.

And nobody knows better than the editor of the News and Observer that the overwhelming weight of authority, as shown by past decisions of the Supreme Court, indicate that that Court will not sustain section five of the proposed amendment, but will knock it out as an unconstitutional and leave the remainder of the amendment to stand.

And everybody knows that if that should be the decision of the Court (as it surely would be unless the Court should reverse its former decisions) that then the effect of this amendment would be to disfranchise very "poor and illiterate white voter in the State," amounting to about sixty thousand, while over fifty thousand negroes would still vote under the amendment.

Now the editor of the News and Observer, knowing this danger to the sixty thousand illiterate white voters if the amendment should be adopted, knowing that the danger is almost certain, is trying to fool these illiterate white voters into voting for it, while Pritchard and Butler are pointing out the danger to these white voters and urging them not to subject themselves and their children to such a danger—the danger of being disfranchised and having their children after them disfranchised and put on a plane lower than the fifty thousand negroes who would be sure to vote under the amendment.

The illiterate white man is more intelligent than the News and Observer gives him credit for being. He knows that if this amendment is adopted he will have the great danger of disfranchisement hanging over him and his children after him. He also knows that if the amendment is defeated, that then there is no danger of him or his children being disfranchised.

He has sense enough to see the danger, and he has too much sense to take the risk simply to help out the scheme of certain politicians who are willing to put him in this dangerous position to carry out their scheme.

Yes, the illiterate white voter is doing his own thinking and he will vote to defeat this dangerous amendment regardless of what the editor of the News and Observer may say on one side or what Pritchard or Butler may say on the other.

## THEIR HOWL, AND THE EXPLANATION.

The other day State Auditor Ayer, in an interview, expressed the desire that the negroes in the State should not register and vote but should leave the white people to settle the constitutional amendment by themselves. The way Democratic organs have denounced Mr. Ayer for giving this interview is simply astonishing. Why should they not gladly accept the suggestion if they are in favor of white men alone voting. No doubt many good citizens will be puzzled at their course. Especially will citizens outside of the State and citizens in Western part of North Carolina be puzzled, but the explanation can easily be found. It is this. If the negroes register and vote in Halifax county, Simmons and his ballot-box stuffers will not count out their votes but will count them all for the Democratic party, giving them about three thousand majority in that county. But in as much as the most reckless ballot-box stuffers cannot steal and count more votes than are passed without defeating his own object, hence if no negroes were registered to vote in Halifax the Democratic majority would necessarily be at least two thousand less than if they were to register and vote. Now the only hope that Mr. Simmons and his ballot-box stuffers have of carrying the amendment and carrying the State is by stealing and counting the negro vote in the east for them and thus to try to pile up a majority big enough to offset the majority against them in the white counties in the remainder of the State. Yes, the negro is the salvation of Mr. Simmons and his machine, and he can only consent to have the negro kept from voting when an equal number of white voters are kept from voting. And this is exactly what he expects to accomplish by the adoption of the proposed amendment.

## LET SOME MEMBERS SPEAK.

THE CAUCASIAN has heard that when the proposed amendment was being discussed and considered by the Democratic caucus in the legislature there was an overwhelming number of members of that body who were outspoken in their opposition to such a radical and vicious method of dealing with the suffrage question. In short, the report of the secret discussion of the measure that has reached us is to the effect that the proposition was declared to be absurd when first presented to

the caucus for consideration. We heard also that many members then and there frankly stated that they had pledged their constituents not to tamper with the suffrage question in the event of their election—in fact, it is said that some members said that they would not dare to return home should they so grossly betray the great trust confided to them. But the machine were bent on doing their devilish work, and our information is that they worked with great energy for some time before a majority of the caucus was persuaded or won over to the support of the disfranchising scheme. And we further understand that some, or many of those who finally surrendered and stifled their convictions, reserved to themselves the right to repudiate the amendment at the polls. Let us have some further light on this important matter. Will some one, having authority to speak, tell us the true condition of it? At least let some one deny it, if he will not tell the whole truth.

## BRYAN IN THE EAST.

Bryan's eastern visit is a great success. He has again demonstrated his wonderful hold upon the masses. In his speeches he has not attempted to conciliate the enmity of Wall Street, to free silver, and his references to the financial question have been warmly applauded as his position on trusts. Imperialism and the attempt of Great Britain to crush the Boers.

Webster's Weekly has several times called attention to the fact that Democratic lawyers who profess to support the Chicago platform and to oppose trusts took money from the trust to defeat the anti-trust bill before the last legislature. Commenting upon this reprehensible conduct of the Democratic lawyers who did this, and contrasting it with the conduct of Chairman Holton in the legislatures of 1895 and 1897, that paper says:

We have mentioned the incident before, but it will bear repeating, that A. E. Holton, Esq., Chairman of the Republican State Executive Committee, declined to represent the School Book Trust before the Fusion Legislature of 1897, upon the ground that whatever influence he had with that body was political and he had no right to make merchandise of it. He was offered \$500 as a retainer, which he refused to accept.

Yes, on more than one occasion did Chairman Holton refuse to take a fee for his political influence in these legislatures. Can Chairman Simmons and his law firm show an equal record?

Senator Money, of Mississippi made a speech a few days ago in support of the constitutionality of the proposed amendment in North Carolina. During his speech he cited two or three Supreme Court decisions which he claims sustains his contention. But when he was interrupted by other Senators who called his attention to the many other decisions of the Court to the contrary, he refused to be interrupted for that purpose, or to allow a citation from those decisions to go into his speech.

The Senator evidently knew that the weight of authority was against him, and he knew that if these decisions from the Court were put into his speech that it could not be circulated in North Carolina by Simmons and his machine.

A few days ago the Democratic papers again suggested that it was time to stop discussing the constitutionality of the proposed amendment. Now Mr. Simmons their State chairman follows and says it is time to stop discussing that question. Of course it is, from their standpoint; for the longer it is discussed the more voters in the State will be against it.

A total eclipse of the sun is announced for May the 28th. The eclipse will not be total over the whole United States. In fact, only for a small strip of territory across the continent, but this strip passes through Raleigh. So the people of this city will have the opportunity of seeing a total eclipse, and it is probable the government authorities will erect an observatory in Raleigh for that occasion to observe the eclipse.

The famous Robert case was settled by the House during the past week. It is doubtful if Congress acted wisely and according to law when it exiled Roberts as the representative elect of the State of Utah instead of first permitting him to take his seat and then expelling him. But however that is, it is certain that the result will do much to completely wipe out polygamy in Utah.

Every American patriot who remembers with pride the heroic struggle of his ancestors in 1776 to gain liberty by throwing off the yoke of British oppression; is watching with deep interest the heroic struggle of the Boers in South Africa against the same English yoke of oppression.

Every voter in the State should read senator Pritchard's reply, which appears on the front page of this week's issue, to the speech of Senator Morgan on the proposed suffrage amendment.

PAIN KILLER, so justly celebrated was introduced to the public about sixty years ago, and now enjoys a popularity unequalled by any other medicine. For the cure of dysentery, cholera morbus, rheumatism, coughs and colds, scalds, burns, etc., it is a most equal. Sold by all druggists. Avoid substitutes, there is but one—Pain-Killer, Perry Davis. Price 25c and 50c.

## ROBERTS EXPELLED FROM HOUSE.

SENATORS CONTINUE TO DISCUSS THE AMENDMENT.

Many Speeches to be Made on it.

Special to THE CAUCASIAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C. The House, after two days discussion and consideration of the report of the Committee on the Robert's case, expelled the member from Utah, by an overwhelming vote, on the ground that he is violating the laws of the United States that were enacted especially to prohibit the practice of polygamy. Mr. Roberts was allowed to make a speech in his own behalf, but the sentiment of the House against his retaining a seat in that body was too strong and determined to be overcome. Consideration of appropriation bills has been the chief work engaging the attention of the House.

In the Senate the discussion of Senator Pritchard's resolution with reference to the proposed amendment has occupied much of the time of that body.

While Senator Pritchard was delivering his famous speech on the amendment to confer suffrage by inheritance, as is proposed in North Carolina, Senator Allen, of Nebraska, an ardent personal and political friend of W. J. Bryan, to inquire of the Senator from North Carolina if the pending amendment would not be a ballot box stuffers' vote, and if the United States, Senator Pritchard replied that it certainly would be, if he was correct in his views as to the attributes and securities of the amendment. He then declared that "such an amendment would be declared by the Courts to be in violation of the spirit or the letter of the Federal Constitution."

The declaration on such an important Constitutional question should have great weight on account of the generally acknowledged ability of Senator Allen as a lawyer.

Senator McENERY, of Louisiana, made a speech on the amendment, and in the course of the speech Senator McENERY if he did not write to the Louisiana Constitutional Convention that the "grandfather clause" was "grossly unconstitutional." Senator McENERY replied as follows: Yes, sir, when the Constitutional Convention was in session I was telegraphed to know what was my opinion of this section 5. I replied to that telegram that in my opinion it was unconstitutional. I then telegraphed to the Times-Democrat, after its adoption, to know if, when it was attacked, I would defend it in the Senate of the United States. To that telegram I replied that I would.

So it will be seen from the above that Senator McENERY not only admits that the measure is unconstitutional, but in supporting it now he has voted against his own admission, so, notwithstanding the fact he still holds that it is unconstitutional.

Senator Butler also called upon Senator McENERY to give his opinion as to whether or not section 5 is unconstitutional. The Courts would knock out that section and leave the remainder of the amendment valid and operative. Senator McENERY replied to the question by saying that it was constitutional. He cited a case from Mississippi to show that the whole amendment would fall if the amendment was unconstitutional, and argued that the Supreme Court has so held in Williams vs. Mississippi 170 U. S.

Senator Butler interrupted and asked permission to cite numerous cases in which the Supreme Court had decided that only the unconstitutional part, if separable, would fall, and the remainder would stand and be operative, but Senator Money deliberately refused to allow him to make the following statement: "After themselves disowning and flaying denouncing section 5 a majority of members of the Constitutional Convention yesterday passed that offensive section, off-mine to Democracy, to political honesty and to Americanism; and the Convention too, has passed this offensive section in face of the fact that the ablest Democrats in the United States Senate have declared it to be unconstitutional." Senators Caffery and McENERY have protested against its passage, and have declared that it contravenes the Federal Constitution. In this opinion they are joined by such stalwart Democrats and uncompromising champions of the rights of the colored people as Indiana's Lindsey, of Kentucky; Vest, of Missouri; Berry, of Arkansas; Walthall, of Mississippi; Turley, of Tennessee; Pettus, of Alabama; McRAURIN, of South Carolina, and many members of the House of Representatives."

With the opinion of these Senators that the "grandfather clause" is unconstitutional, it should cause all men who before voting should be sworn to support the Constitution of the United States to vote against the infamous measure, which was simply a "triumph of politicians" in our eyes.

The subject of this sketch departed this life on Jan. 13th, 1900, at his home at Davis, Carteret county, N. C., at the ripe old age of about 85 years. He was during his entire life an honest and upright gentleman. The needy always found in him a friend. He leaves a widow, 3 sons and 1 daughter to mourn their loss. He was a kind and loving husband and father, generous to his neighbors and loyal to his State.

Since he is gone, we deem it not a mail thing as a dear friend to extend our heart-felt sympathy, and to express our esteem for his faithful service to our State. Let all try and emulate his good qualities and so live in this world that we may all meet in the "next world" as he would say.

"A precious one from us has gone,  
A voice we loved is all;  
A place is vacant in our home  
Which never can be filled."

H. R. HOGGINS.

## THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY.

They Were Dearly Bought and Should be Jealously Preserved.

Personal or civil liberty is that boon which man values most dearly, and which he is most prone to neglect.

In the profane enjoyment of his Maker, self-reliant and strong. Take from him this inherent natural right, through the agency of some tyrant, and he is degraded, and he is a mere machine, worked by the hand of power. When a state properly enjoys liberty its progress is rapid and its people are happy. When the liberties of the people are abused and degraded the state retrogrades. The proper uses of liberty, in a free government where emulation receives its impetus, are the support of the citizen and produces culture, refinement, art, science, invention, learning, eloquence, oratory, statesmanship, religion and morality, the highest of all. No other form of government advances the virtues and interests of the people to such superiority and pre-eminence. It invites competition. It is the lever of progress, it is the friend of ambition. Hence, when the whole people, like the individual man, are inspired with a pure, patriotic and instructive love of liberty, the State becomes great, illustrious and mighty. The citizens of a free State have no superior, and the point of liberty, or in point of law, the humble tax payer is entitled to the same rights and privileges and the same protection to which the grand son of any man should be entitled. The law is a free government is not a respecter of persons, nor should it make any distinction in so far as liberty is concerned "as law is justice." In a free government the Constitution is the guardian of the citizen certain safeguards or protections to his liberties by jury; it secures him against unlawful searches and seizures; it protects him against arrests, except on oath made by a responsible person. If maliciously arrested or imprisoned, he has redress by action against the informant or magistrate for trespass or false imprisonment. In a free or elective system of government, as in the U. S., where a written constitution has been adopted, the different branches of government are so well marked

out and defined, and the duties and offices of each are so independent and distinct that under no possible circumstances can usurpations in any or encroachments of one upon the other be excused. Any usurpations whatever in either branch leads to anarchy, demoralization and finally disruption.

The blow of the last legislature of North Carolina in the attempt to deprive the "now partisan" or the "free thinkers" of his liberty by an unfair election law may not be allowed to strike into the very heart of liberty. A happy and contented working class is the only safe guard of any country, and especially in a country like ours where every man is guaranteed a voice in the administration of the affairs of government.

Instead of attempting to make a law to deprive the most humble man in the State of his liberty about all a big majority have left except a mortgage on his little home or spotted ox.

The last legislature should have guarded, fostered and secured to the people their liberties, pure and simple, and from any infringement by the makers, the administration and the expounders of the law. "It (liberty) says Burke" is not only a private blessing of the first order, but the vital spring of energy of the State itself which has just as much life and vigor as there is liberty in it." To protect liberty the streams of legislative administration and justice must be kept clear from the fountain head to the bottom box. Same exacted against the rights and liberties of the plain people are as deleterious to the peace and welfare of the State as the unbridled, unrestrained and licentious abuse of them by the citizens.

The Magna Charter signed by King John on the 15th of June, 1215, laid the foundation for a constitution which has engrained in it the attributes and securities of personal liberty, and stands a monument of enlightened statesmanship, worthy the pride and admiration of the English people, while the great charter itself denotes an abiding and permanent bond of friendship between despotism and liberty.

The proudest appellations a man can bear is that of American citizen. "I am an American citizen" (in of liberty and safety, protection, and which has engrained in it the attributes and securities of personal liberty, and stands a monument of enlightened statesmanship, worthy the pride and admiration of the English people, while the great charter itself denotes an abiding and permanent bond of friendship between despotism and liberty.

Mr. Webster exclaimed: "It" (free speech) is a homebred right. It is a privilege which has been enjoyed in every home, cottage and cabin in the nation. It is a right which cannot be invaded without destroying constitutional liberty. The right to vote and to be elected to office is a right which should be guarded and protected by the freemen of this country with a jealous care unless they are prepared for anarchy and anarchy. Consolidation of liberty and centralization of power is complete when liberty can dictate the affairs of our State by adopting a rule and forming a trust on the will of the people. Parties and politics sink into utter insignificance when liberty is produced of all wealth is hushed by dishonest "dudes" liberty is too valuable a privilege and has been too costly an inheritance to be bartered away for the gratification of a few men, and the animosity and will never be parted with by the people of our dear "Old North State" for a price less than what it cost. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Z. T. GARRETT.

## WHO ARE PARTISAN?

It all depends upon them upon whose Ox is Gored.

The Populist newspaper, THE CAUCASIAN, has placed the Raleigh Post and some of its partisan contemporaries in a tight position in arraigning them on their criticism of the State Supreme Court for its decision in the Abbott-Beedingfield case. These papers have called the decision a partisan one, and they have held up their hands in pious horror at the act of the court.

As THE CAUCASIAN observes, it all depends upon whose Ox is gored—in other words these newspapers which are calling the decision a partisan one, are nothing right that is not in favor of their own party's schemes have placed themselves in a most ridiculous position by this criticism of the Supreme Court, when only two years ago they applauded the same court—the same identical judges in rendering the decision—for exactly the same judgment they have now rendered, the only difference being that the decision of two years ago overthrew an act of a republican legislature and was in favor of a Democratic one. The Post and the Raleigh Post and other machine ballot box stuffing organs should look back over their files and see what they themselves said about Hoke vs. Henderson, and also about the court when this same court in the case of Wood vs. Bellamy applied the same doctrine as applied in Abbott vs. Beedingfield to put a Populist out of office and a Democrat in.

These same Democratic papers then thought that Hoke vs. Henderson was a great decision, and they even went so far as to praise the present court for upholding that doctrine. It now seems that these papers had no conviction on the matter, but all of their praise was due to the fact that the decision put a Democrat in office.

The Wood-Bellamy decision took Colonel V. S. Lusk, a Republican, out of the board of directors of the State Asylum at Morganton and put Capt. J. P. Sawyer in. At the same time the court decided in favor of Abbott vs. Beedingfield. The fact is the decisions of the Supreme Court that are based on the Hoke-Henderson decision of the distinguished Chief Justice Ruffin exhibit very clearly the fact that the court is not governed by partisan motives and the attempt to show that the court is a partisan Democratic party organ, with equal clearness shows how narrowly partisan they are.

Hon. Thomas B. Reed on Monopolies.

Mr. Reed's paper on Monopolies which is to appear in the Saturday Evening Post of February 19, is a suggestive discussion of the methods of vast corporations. It discusses in a striking and original manner one of the most pressing questions of the day.

Ordered to Winston-Salem.

Wilmington, N. C., Jan. 29.—Surgeon General Wyman has ordered Dr. C. P. Warriner, Surgeon in charge of the Marine Hospital here, to proceed to Winston-Salem, N. C., and investigate the small pox situation there.

## WOMEN FEAR LA GRIPPE AND CATARRH.

Pe-ru-na a Reliable Protection.



MRS. THEOPHILE SCHMITT, OF CHICAGO.

The leading effects of La Grippe and Catarrh of this country have come to regard Pe-ru-na as indispensable to their success.

Mrs. Theophile Schmitt, wife of the Secretary of the German consulate, writes the following letter to Dr. Hartman, from 3417 Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill. Mrs. Schmitt says: "I suffered this winter with a severe attack of La Grippe, and having repeatedly heard of the value of Pe-ru-na in such cases I thought I would try it. I used it faithfully and began to feel a change for the better the second day, and in the course of a week I was very much improved. After using three bottles I not only found that the grippe had disappeared, but my general health was much better. I am satisfied that Pe-ru-na is a wonderful family remedy and gladly endorse it. Yours, Mrs. Theophile Schmitt."

Mrs. M. E. Wheeler, Rockford, Tenn., writes: "I am very glad to write you that I am in every way cured of catarrh with which I have been troubled for ten years or more. I feel very grateful to you for curing my catarrh, and which has not only cured me, but I have felt no symptoms of the catarrh for over a year. If you think this letter will be of any use to suffering humanity you may use it."

La Grippe is acute, epidemic catarrh. There is no remedy in the world that meets this form of catarrh as thoroughly as Pe-ru-na. During the first stages of La Grippe Pe-ru-na is an unfailing remedy. People who have had La Grippe and have partly recovered, but remain half sick, will find Pe-ru-na exactly suited to their case. There is no remedy devised that will so quickly and thoroughly dispel the disagreeable and serious effects of catarrh as Pe-ru-na.

All women praise Pe-ru-na after one trial. It is safe to say that no woman ever took one bottle of Pe-ru-na who did not become a life long advocate of this remarkable remedy. Never was a medicine devised of so much value to women. Pe-ru-na is a household remedy sent free by Dr. Hartman, Columbus, O.

New York City.

Given on a Half Holiday.

Vice-President E. St. John, of the Seaboard Air Line, in keeping with the broad spirit that marks the new year, and which has not only cured me, but I have felt no symptoms of the catarrh for over a year. If you think this letter will be of any use to suffering humanity you may use it."

There is nothing more pleasing to look upon than a hearty, ruddy face, gained by honest toil. They are the saving of the nation, these toilers of both sexes, struggling for daily bread.

Pure blood makes them able to keep up the daily round of duty at home, shop or store. If the blood has a taint of impurity, or a run down feeling comes on, the remedy is Hood's Sarsaparilla, America's Greatest Medicine for the blood. Poor Blood—A ruddy blood was so poor, that I felt weaker. I felt cold. Hood's Sarsaparilla made me warm. It is the right thing in the right place." Hattie J. Taylor, Woodstock, N. J.

Hood's Sarsaparilla Never Disappoints.

Hood's Pills cure liver ills; the non-purging and only cathartic to take with Hood's Sarsaparilla.

OLD STEEL OR DEATH.

"There is but one small chance to save your life and that is through an operation," was the awful prospect before Mrs. L. B. Hunt, of Lime Ridge, Wis., by her doctor after vainly trying to cure her of a frightful case of stomach trouble and indigestion. He did not count on the marvellous power of Electric Bitters to cure her of Liver troubles, but she heard of it, took seven bottles, was wholly cured, avoided surgeon's knife, now weighs more and feels better than ever. It is positively guaranteed to cure Stomach, Liver and Kidney troubles and never disappoints. Price 50c at all drug stores.

Plants of It.

"Has he a voice of much volume?" "My dear boy, it's a three volume voice, illustrated and printed in colors."—Chicago Post.

At every post office, one young lady who desires to go off to college, to a boarding school, or to a foreign country, per published in the interest of Little Women. The subscription Send namphile is ten cents a year. Give for information and a copy, to The Visitor, Littleton, Colo.

## POU'S CAMPAIGN AFFIDAVIT.

ONE OF HIS METHODS OF FOOLING VOTERS IN THE LAST CAMPAIGN.

HE MAKES AFFIDAVIT THAT A PROPOSITION TO DISFRANCHISE NEGROES AND ILLITERATE WHITES WOULD NOT RECEIVE A SINGLE DEMOCRATIC VOTE IN THE LEGISLATURE AND DENOUNCES THOSE WHO MAKE THE CHARGE AS SPEAKING FALSELY AND TRYING TO FOOL THE PEOPLE.

From Caucasian Oct. 19.

The following affidavit made by James H. Pou, ex-Chairman of the State Democratic Executive Committee, during the last campaign, will be interesting reading, our readers will remember that whenever and wherever it was charged in the last campaign that if the Democratic machine under Simmons got control of the State, that they would offer a scheme to disfranchise illiterate votes, that the charge was indignantly denied and denounced by every Democratic speaker as being infamously false. Even Mr. Simmons, the Democratic candidate for Governor, made an official statement to the voters of the State, branding every such charge as false in toto; saying that that campaign lie had been charged against the Democratic party because, and that the charge was now so old and so false that no one would believe it.

Mr. James H. Pou, the ex-Chairman of the State Democratic Committee, in his speech, made the same declaration. But it seems that in one of his speeches in More county, some members of his audience expressed doubt of the truth of his indignant denial, and called upon him to stand upon the stand to know if he would make good his affidavit to that effect. He publicly agreed to do so, we are informed. The result is the affidavit below, made at Raleigh, dated Oct. 14th, 1897. It will be noticed that Mr. Pou, showed himself as cunning as he is, attempted to word his affidavit so as not to say explicitly what he had said publicly on the stump, and yet at the same time, to say enough to make it appear that his affidavit had made good his campaign declaration, and fool the voters into accepting his statement and voting for the machine.

The following is a true copy of the affidavit of James H. Pou, ex-Chairman of the State Democratic Committee, of North Carolina, County of Wake.

James H. Pou, being duly sworn, deposes and says: "I have never said that, if the Democrats regained control of the State, they intended to disfranchise the negroes and illiterate white voters. I never have said anything like this, and I know that this is not the intention of the Democratic party. I have never heard a single Democrat give utterance to such a sentiment, and I do not believe, if such a proposition comes before the General Assembly, that it would receive a single Democratic vote. I have never heard of the uneducated white voters of North Carolina are Democrats. The Democratic party is appealing to them for aid in preserving white supremacy in the center west and restoring it in the Eastern part of this State. They are responding to our appeal, and to repay them for their aid with a disfranchisement of their votes would be folly and ingratitude. Indeed, the man who makes these charges know they speak falsely, but their campaign this year is run upon the idea that the people of North Carolina would rather believe a falsehood than to have the truth. I would rather hear lies upon the honored dead than to hear arguments based upon truth."

(Signed) JAMES H. POU.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 14th day of October 1898.

(Signed) GEO. W. THOMPSON, Notary Public.

Notarial Seal, Geo. W. Thompson, Notary Public, Raleigh, N. C.

Two five cent "documentary" revenue stamps attached.

## "Honest Labor Bears a Lovely Face."

There is nothing more pleasing to look upon than a hearty, ruddy face, gained by honest toil. They are the saving of the nation, these to







